

REMARKS

These remarks follow the order of the paragraphs of the office action. Relevant portions of the office action are shown indented and italicized.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the applicant's communication filed on November 7, 2006. 2. Claims 1-40 are presented for examination.

3. The applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 17, 20, 25, 27, and 31 in the amendment received on November 7, 2006.

4. Applicants' arguments filed on November 7, 2006 have been fully considered but are not deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Remarks

5. The Examiner kindly requests that the applicant reviews the claims and remove the typo errors (i.e., qqqq, 'etc.') presented in the pending claims.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that the typo errors occur in claim 1 which is canceled herein.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 20-22, 34, 35, and 40 objected to because of the following informalities: Independent claim 20 is being objected to because of a minor informality to the preamble. The examiner recommends that the applicants consider amending the preamble to include hardware. The preamble should recite a 'computer implemented' method. Appropriate correction is required.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that claim 20 is amended to overcome the rejection by having the preamble recite a 'computer implemented' method.. This overcomes the objections to Claim 20 and Claims 21-22, 34, 35, and 40 that depend on claim 20. Thus Claims 20-22, 34, 35, and 40 are allowable.

Claim Rejections- 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 1, 12, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As follows:

Claims 1, 12, 17, 19, 23-27, 29-33, 37, and 39 are rejected under 35 USC. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1, 17, 25, 27, and 31 collectively are directed to search queries, mapping relevant objects, connecting categories to paths, and choosing a best path for a criterion based on the relevance of the mapped objects. The claimed inventions, as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete, and tangible result." State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. MPEP 2106. In each of these cases the **result** is mapping and connecting categories. The claimed limitations are an abstraction as they are not **useful, concrete, and tangible**, they are not put in any tangible form and not useful because they are not presented in a way to provide some result that is of utility that may exist in the specification however no specific use is provided for in the claimed invention. Thus the claims are non-statutory and stand rejected under 101 as not producing a "useful, concrete, and tangible result."

Although, independent claims 1, 17, 25, 27, and 31 are performing a query search, the independent claims do not provide a useful, concrete, and tangible result about the results of the query search. What happens to the query search in these claims as a result of information being searched for? Is the query search conducted in an effort to retrieve data for display, output, etc.

Also, claims 1, 17, 25, 27, and 31 should be amended to state that the search query is being implemented by hardware. The examiner recommends amending the preamble of the claims to state a 'computer implemented' method, apparatus, or system.

Likewise, dependent claims 12, 19, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 32, and 33 are non- statutory because these dependent claims comprise an article of manufacture or a program storage device, while their dependency depends on independent claims that are claiming an apparatus or method.

Thus, the remaining dependent claims not mentioned in the above rejections are also rejected for being dependent upon the above recited independent claims, these claims are also rejected for the reasons set forth above.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that in order to bring the objected-to claims to allowance quickly, the rejected claims, Claims 1, 12, 17, 19, 23-27, 29-33, 37 and 39 are all canceled. It is expected that the rejected claims will be further prosecuted in a continuation.

1 It is anticipated that this amendment results in the quick allowance of Claims 20-22, 34, 35, and
2 40.

3 Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper to deposit account 50-0510.

4 Respectfully submitted,

5 By: /Louis Herzberg/
6 Dr. Louis P. Herzberg
7 Reg. No. 41,500
8 Voice Tel. (845) 352-3194
9 Fax. (845) 352-3194

10 3 Cloverdale Lane
11 Monsey, NY 10952

12 Customer Number: 54856